

I come to the floor today to pay tribute to the millions and millions of everyday people all around the world, including throughout the United States, who have expressed so clearly their conviction that a U.S.-led invasion of Iraq is not the answer.

I come to pay tribute to the city of Chicago, one of about 100 U.S. cities whose elected leaders, responding to their citizens, voted "no" to a preemptive war. In Chicago it was by a vote of 46 to 1.

We are on the brink of the first war in history started by the United States against a country that has not threatened violence against the United States. We are on the brink of implementing a new policy of preemptive war, and ushering in not a new world order but a world of unprecedented disorder.

Let us examine the facts: Iraq is led by a tyrannical dictator, one who may have, who probably has, chemical and biological weapons; one who violates human rights and oppresses his people; the same tyrannical dictator, by the way, who was our ally in the 1980s when Iraq was at war with Iran; the same dictator to whom we sent chemical and biological materials in the eighties; the same dictator who we now charge with using chemical and biological weapons, but at the time, the United States refused to support a U.N. resolution condemning Iraq.

□ 1415

The same Saddam who was in place in 1998 when the Haliburton Company, led by Vice President DICK CHENEY, was doing business in Iraq. The same dictator that has onerous characteristics that can be applied to many other countries, many of which we call ally, friends and coalition partner. And can be applied to countries like North Korea and Iran, who pose an even greater danger to the United States.

So why Iraq and why now? I stand here today as a patriot and particularly resentful, not only for myself, but all of my constituents who oppose this war because we deeply love this country. But we believe that this war fails to meet the threshold test. Will it make us citizens and residents of the United States safer? Will it make the Middle East, and of particular concern to me, Israel, safer? Will it make the world safer?

I say the answer is, and I feel in my heart, a resounding no.

The Central Intelligence Agency reports that Saddam is likely to use chemical and biological weapons only if we attack. Saddam and Iraq had nothing to do with September 11, or at the time, Osama bin Laden, despite desperate attempts by this administration to link them. But an attack on Iraq now could meld an unlikely coalition of terrorist organizations and fundamental Muslim organizations that will be a real threat to the United States and other countries around the globe.

Most importantly, we have real options to disarm Saddam Hussein. The way this debate has been shaped is you are either for all-out war, or you are for nothing and that could not be further from the truth.

Saddam Hussein must be disarmed and no one disagrees with that. And we have a structure for doing that. The United Nations was set up for that, is ready to do that and with the mighty leadership that the United States could exert, can do an even better job to make sure that Saddam Hussein who has, in fact, been violating resolutions, will comply now with disarmament. We can be part of a large and growing coalition of civilized nations who says that in this 21st century, where the technology allows for chemical and biological and even nuclear weapons to proliferate around the globe, and it will be hard given this century and this knowledge to stop that, unless we have a coalition of civilized nations that will surround and isolate rogue states and rogue nations.

We should lead in developing that coalition. We do not have to go to war now. I say no war on behalf of my constituents and to this Congress.

#### DANGER OF UNILATERAL ACTION AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush continues to strongly suggest that America will go to war against Iraq without the support of the United Nations or a significant number of our traditional European allies. Following his lead, many Americans, as well as media commentators, have become critical of the United Nations and the member nations of the Security Council that have expressed opposition to U.S. military action at this time.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States is needlessly losing the world opinion war with dangerous implications for the real war against Iraq or, even worse, for the larger war against terrorism.

I voted against the congressional resolution that authorized unilateral U.S. military action against Iraq in part because of my fear that President Bush would have less incentive to create the type of world coalition that was so successful in the Gulf War. We tend to forget that the Gulf War was successful in many ways beyond the mere fact that the U.S. liberated Kuwait. The coalition of support meant that many countries provided manpower, money, and the political support that made U.S. actions justified in world opinions, even in Muslim countries.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, we now face with Iraq is very different. The logistics to carry out the war may suffer from the inability to utilize bases or air flight over countries that were previously supportive in the Gulf War.

The cost of the war will be borne almost entirely by the United States. President Bush has not included the costs, estimated from 50- to \$200 billion in his budget. And this does not even include the cost to rebuild Iraq. It also does not include assistance that other countries are demanding. For example, Turkey, which has asked for an aid package in the tens of billions.

My greater concern, Mr. Speaker, is whether the lack of support by other countries stiffens the resolve of the Iraqis to fight and makes it more difficult for U.S. forces to conduct the war or alternatively encourage the fundamentalist forces that perceive American action as anti-Muslim and, therefore, accelerate terrorist attacks against the United States.

I keep asking why the Bush administration feels it is necessary to adopt the rhetoric of unilateral action given the perils that might accompany it. Why do the President and his advisors insist that they do not need the United Nations and our traditional allies even while they pursue resolutions in the Security Council and try to convince other countries to support us.

It often seems that their rhetoric makes it all the more difficult to achieve the world coalition that was so successful in the Gulf War.

Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that in the next few days and the next few weeks, the Bush administration make every effort to achieve the support of the United Nations as well as the key countries such as France, Germany, Russia and China that have voiced U.S. opposition to U.S. policy in Iraq. The President can best accomplish this goal if he makes it clear that a world coalition is crucial to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can avoid a war altogether by working within the Security Council to successfully disarm Iraq. I still hope that that can be accomplished. But absent that, the President must work a lot harder to build a world coalition to support a war if it is going to take place and avoid the political perils of unilateral military action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BIRCH BAYH FEDERAL BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) legislation naming the Federal Courthouse located at 46 East Ohio Street, Indianapolis, as the Birch